

Remarks

The Office Action mailed July 12, 2007 addresses and rejects claims 1-27. For the reasons discussed below, Applicant submits that the claims as now amended distinguish over the prior art and requests that the claim rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Claim Amendments

Applicant amends claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 14-17, and 19-22. Claims 3-5, 18, 23 and 24 are cancelled. The amendments to the claims are made to clarify the subject matter of the invention and to obviate certain drawing objections that the Examiner has made.

In particular, claim 1 has been amended to make it clear that the opening is formed in one of the front or back sheets and that the flap is formed from at least one of the first and second sheets. In addition, claim 1 further requires that the first adhesive layer be adapted to be folded over the opening such that it contacts the opening. Claim 6 has been amended to obviate a § 112 rejection and to clarify the nature of the opening. Claims 9, 14-17, 21, and 22 have been amended to obviate § 112 rejections alleging a lack of antecedent basis. Claim 17 has been amended to clarify the nature of the invention as well.

Support for the claim amendments is found throughout the application as filed and no new matter is added.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has made numerous objections to the drawings, and Applicant submits that these objections are either obviated by claim amendments or improper for reasons discussed below.

Claim 1 has been amended, as discussed above, to obviate the Examiner's objection. The claimed subject matter is clearly shown in the drawings, particularly in FIG. 4.

Applicants traverse the objections to claim 16 and 20. 37 CFR § 1.83 does not absolutely require that every feature of the claimed invention be illustrated. Rather, the first sentence of 37 CFR § 1.83 is qualified by the statement that it is not necessary to illustrate “conventional” features for which an illustration is not needed to gain a proper understanding of the invention. With regard to claim 16, one skilled in the art clearly will understand the concept of front and back sheets having different thicknesses without an illustration of this feature. The same is true for claim 20, which requires the top end of the dust jacket cover to be heat sealed. This is especially true in view of FIG. 4, which could be interpreted to show a heat sealed top portion.

Applicant submits that the objection to claim 21 is obviated by the amendment of the claim. The Figures clearly show features now specified in claim 21.

Applicant submits that the features of claim 22 are shown, at least in FIG. 4, as the front and back portion (sheets) are arbitrary designations that depend on the orientation of the dust jacket cover.

The objections to claims 3 and 23 are moot in view of the cancellation of these claims.

For these reasons, Applicant submits that the specification and drawings fully comply with 37 CFR § 1.83 without the need for additional drawings, and withdrawal of the drawing objections is respectfully requested.

Specification Objections

Applicant traverses the objections to the specification and submits that all claimed features are fully supported. Support for a “flexible polymeric material” can be found in paragraph [0022] of the published application while support for resistance to infrared and ultraviolet light” can be found at paragraph [0023] of the published application. Paragraph [0024] of the published application provides support for the thickness of the sheets. Claim amendments and/or cancellations obviate the remaining objections made by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

Claim 5 is cancelled, thereby obviating the objection to this claim made by the Examiner.

§ 112 Rejections

Applicant submits that the claims as now amended overcome the § 112, second paragraph, rejections made by the Examiner and that the claims fully comply with the requirements of § 112. Claim 5 has been cancelled and claims 6, 8, 9, and 14-17, and 19-22 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis.

The specification fully supports the limitation in claims 12 and 27 requiring the polymeric material to be resistant to infrared and ultraviolet light. This is an inherent property of the materials used, and one skilled in the art will clearly appreciate the scope of the invention. Accordingly, applicant submits that the § 112 rejection of claims 12 and 27 should likewise be withdrawn.

Prior Art-Based Rejections

§ 102(b) Rejections

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-13, 17-20, and 26-27 as being anticipated pursuant to 35 USC § 102(b) by GB 2132585 (“GB”). Applicant traverses this rejection and submits that the claims are distinct from the GB reference.

Claim 1 requires that the opening be formed in one of the front sheet or the back sheet, and this is a feature not disclosed by the GB reference. The GB reference instead discloses what is essentially an envelope. That is, one sheet (i.e., the front sheet) is shorter than the other (back) sheet and this size differential creates an opening. Claim 1 requires that the *opening be formed in the front sheet* (or the back sheet). This claim thus does not read on a structure such as that disclosed in the GB reference that has an opening formed by the size difference in two sheets that are joined together.

Independent claim 17 has a similar limitation requiring that the opening be formed in one of the front or back portions of a sheet that forms a dust jacket cover. However, claim 17 further requires that the front a back portions be formed from a folded single sheet and that the dust jacket cover have a first adhesive layer as well as a second adhesive layer that is opposite the first adhesive layer. The GB reference fails to disclose the limitation noted above for claim 1, which is also present in claim 17. In addition, the GB reference fails to disclose the additional limitations of claim 17 directed to the single folded sheet and the location of the second adhesive layer.

For these reasons, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 17 each distinguish over the GB reference. Claims 3, 5-9, and 11-13 depend from claim 1 and claims 18-20 and 26-27 depend from claim 17 and likewise distinguish over the GB reference.

Claims 1-13 and 17-27 are also rejected over US 6,270,256 (Todman) on the basis of 35 USC § 102(b).

Todman is similar to the GB reference. However, it is not clear from the drawings or the description of Todman whether the opening 8 is formed in one of the sheets or whether, like the GB reference, it is formed as a result of size differential in the sheets. In any event, Todman fails to disclose first and second adhesive layers formed opposite each other. Independent claims 1 and 17 each require first and second adhesive layers, with the second layer disposed opposite the first layer. Claim 1 further requires that the first adhesive layer be adapted to be folded over the opening to contact the opening. No such structure is disclosed by Todman.

For these reasons, claims 1-13 and 17-27 distinguish over the Todman reference.

Obviousness Rejections

The Examiner also rejects dependent claims 14-16 as being obvious over the GB reference. These claims depend from claim 1, which distinguishes over the GB reference for the reasons noted above. Claims 14-16 likewise distinguish over this reference by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the obviousness rejection of claims 14-16 based on the GB reference be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 1-15 are rejected as being obvious over the Todman reference. These claims, as noted above, depend from claim 1, which distinguishes over the Todman reference for the reasons noted above. Claims 14-15 likewise distinguish over this reference by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the obviousness rejection of claims 14-15 based on Todman be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 4, 2008

By: /William C. Geary III
William C. Geary III
Registration No.: 31,359
NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP

(617) 439-2766
(617) 310-9766 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

1695438.1